



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,015	08/09/2001	Andrew R. Golding	10984-601001	4152
26161	7590	05/20/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			LY, ANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,015

Applicant(s)

GOLDING, ANDREW R.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is response to Applicant's response filed on 02/27/2005.
2. Claims 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 18, 23 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,671,681 issued to Emens et al. (hereinafter Emens).

With respect to claim 1, Emens teaches enumerating plausible queries of a target database using query generation rules (alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from

Art Unit: 2162

other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query: col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; also see figs. 1 & 2); and

generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules (the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries: col. 2, lines 48-67 and see figs. 1 & 2).

With respect to claim 7, Emens teaches wherein the target database resides on a server connected to the Internet (abstract, col. 2, lines 50-67).

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 16, Emens teaches pre-processing a target database (matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database: abstract, col. 2, lines 55-67 and col. 3, lines 1-65);

building a mapping from selected queries to associated teasers for the target database (matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results: col. 3, lines 45-65);

receiving a user query for target database (fig. 1, box 10, where the search is received for retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request); and

returning an associated teaser if user query matches ones the selected queries (search output in figs 1 & 2: displaying of the search query string results for viewing: col. 3, lines 15-42):

With respect to claim 18, Emens teaches wherein building a mapping comprises storing each of the selected queries with the associated teaser (matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results: col. 3, lines 45-65).

With respect to claim 23, Emens teaches displaying the associated teaser (see figs 1 and 2: a summarizing of best matches from search/alternate queries for viewing).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-6, 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,671,681 issued to Emens et al. (hereinafter Emens) in view of Pub. No.: US 2002/0103809 of Starzl et al. (hereinafter Starzl).

With respect to claim 2, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing

of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach a lookup table.

However, Starzl teaches lookup table for query generating system (sections 0018 and 0078).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 3, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and

displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach a lookup table.

However, Starzl teaches lookup table for query generating system (sections 0018 and 0078).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 4, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the

Art Unit: 2162

database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach wherein the query generation rules are domain specific.

However, Starzl teaches rules or heuristics for matching the search query (sections 0020, 0043 and 0048).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 5, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current

search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach wherein the query matching rules are domain specific.

However, Starzl teaches rules and heuristics for query matching system (sections 0043 and 0048).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 6, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches)

and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach conflict resolution rules.

However, Starzl teaches rules and heuristics for query generating system (sections 0020, 0043, 0048 and 0088).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 17, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users

Art Unit: 2162

(more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach query-generation rules and query-matching rules.

However, Starzl teaches rules and heuristics for query generating system, as well for matching (sections 0020, 0043, 0048 and 0088).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 19, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach a trie data structure.

However, Starzl teaches a hierarchical tree structure (section 0008).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 20, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach hash table.

However, Starzl teaches hash table (section 0087).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 21, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach a cache.

However, Starzl teaches memory resources (sections 0008-0009 and 0038).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

With respect to claim 22, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches alternate queries, which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query; the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries; matching of the current result with the prior search result for building the queries that match the database; matching manager building the matching queries to the database and displaying the query string results; retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request; and displaying of the search query string results for viewing. Emens does not clearly teach lookup table.

However, Starzl teaches query generating system for look-up table (sections 0018 and 0078).


Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens with the teachings of Starzl, wherein the search queries or alternate queries are built from adding keyterms based on the received initial query in the system provided therein (Emens' figs. 1 & 2, col. 6, lines 12-28), would incorporate the use of query generating system for adding search query to the lookup table, in the same conventional manner as described by Starzl (sections 0018 and 0078). The motivation being to provide best matches to the search queries from a searchable database over the Internet network.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to **(571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

ANH LY 
May 9th, 2005


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER